



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

MF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/947,221	10/08/97	CHAKRABARTI	S AM9-97-120

LMC1/0829

JOHN L. ROGITZ, ESQ.  
ROGITZ & ASSOCIATES  
SYMPHONY TOWERS  
750 "B" STREET, SUITE 3120  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101

EXAMINER

LE, U

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2771

DATE MAILED:

08/29/00

16

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

TR



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 16

Application Number: 08/947,221  
Filing Date: October 08, 1997  
Appellant(s): CHAKRABARTI ET AL.

John L. Rogitz (Reg. No. 33,549)  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

**RECEIVED**

**AUG 29 2000**

**Group 2700**

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed 22 July 2000.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Invention**

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Issues**

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) Grouping of Claims**

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-11, 12 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

**(8) Claims Appealed**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

5,778,362	DEERWESTER	7-1998
5,855,015	SHOHAM	12-1998

Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, Third Edition, 1997, pages 240, 478

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

Art Unit: 2771

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). These rejections are set forth in prior Office Action, Paper No. 14.

**(11) Response to Argument**

Regarding claim 1, applicant argues that although Deerwester mentions URLs, it is not in the context of relevance values.

In response, URLs equate with hyperlinks as shown in the definition given in the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary. Deerwester clearly shows that the invention can be used as an on-line research tool for retrieving information of interest from databases on a network (see column 1, lines 6-16, column 8, lines 24-32). How could applicant believe that URLs on a network reference one another regardless of relevance?

Regarding claim 12, applicant argues that nowhere does Shoham teach using asymmetric values such as hyperlinks or other references between documents as metrics in the search heuristics.

In response, applicant seems to argue limitations not reflected in the claim language. Nowhere in claim 12 does applicant claim using hyperlinks or references between documents as metrics in a search heuristics. Claim 12 merely requires obtaining affinity values for each collection of entity, the affinity values not being constrained to be symmetric. Shoham explicitly discloses such asymmetry when Shoham shows that a

Art Unit: 2771


hypermedia collection may be represented by a directed graph having nodes which represent resources and arcs which represent embedded links between resources (see column 2, lines 28-30). The claimed affinity values merely read on the nodes in the directed graph of Shoham.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

UL  
August 27, 2000

  
WAYNE AMSBURY  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

  
THOMAS G. BLACK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2700